



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

man who should needlessly set foot upon a worm ; and it will not be denied that this language is expressive of a disposition which promptly commends itself to the just and benevolent feelings of our nature. Yes, it is beyond all question that, as men, as creatures of God, we are to be sparing even of the blood of a brute animal, of the life even of an insect. And what shall we say, then, when we steadily contemplate the scenes which have now been laid open before us ; when we see, not mere worms and insects destroyed, but human beings ; men, created in our own likeness, horribly mangled and torn to pieces ; in some cases, thousands of acres of ground covered with piles of dead ; women and children pierced through, and dashed down, and trodden into the dust ; the wounded left to perish on bleak snows, or burnt to death in their own hospitals ; multitudes frozen with the cold and perishing with famine ; every possible form and degree of agony and despair ? Can we be deemed unreasonable in saying that this is a state of things which must be met, must be looked into ? that it is high time for philosophers, for politicians, above all for professed Christians, to scrutinize it with the deepest solicitude ? Shall the attention of the whole scientific and intellectual world be directed to the comparatively trifling circumstance of the discovery of a new plant, to the fall of a meteoric stone, or to some atmospheric phenomenon,—and shall war, that great moral phenomenon, so inexplicable as to strike angels with astonishment, and to fill even the spirits of darkness with wonder, be deemed of so little consequence as to arrest no thought, excite no feeling, and secure no spirit of inquiry ?

---

NATIONAL HONOR A PLEA FOR WAR.

BY HON. WILLIAM JAY.

A cause frequently assigned in justification of war is the preservation of national honor : one party demands a concession as due to his honor, and the other refuses it as inconsistent with his, and thus the work of slaughter commences for a sentiment—for the preservation of a character which probably neither merits nor possesses.

Sir Robert Peel, the present Premier of Great Britain, in a late speech to his constituents remarked, “ I do hope that neither this country nor the United States will be *mad* enough to allow a difference of opinion about a boundary to set them

in a hostile position towards each other. Undoubtedly it is necessary for each country to maintain its honor, *for without maintaining its honor, no country is safe.*"

Language like this was unworthy the character and station of the gentleman who used it, belonging as it does, by prescriptive right, to bar-room politicians and town-meeting demagogues. No country safe without maintaining its honor! Alas! then, for Great Britain, for at the very time these words were uttered she was waging against China one of the most dishonorable and detestable wars that has ever stained her annals. Indeed, it is difficult to point to a war recorded in history waged more directly against the health, morals and happiness of a numerous people, or from motives more basely sordid, than the British opium war; and yet he who is now the prime agent and director of war talks of the safety of Great Britain as resting on the maintenance of her honor!

We have used strong expressions in regard to this war, and we have used them deliberately, not only from a thorough conviction of their truth, but also from a belief that it is the duty of every friend of justice and humanity to bear his testimony against the cruel and heartless conduct of the British government.

The assault upon China affords, moreover, too strong and apt an illustration of the evils of war and the duty of preserving peace, to be overlooked in the present treatise. This is not the place to enter into a minute exposition of the iniquity of this war, and of the ravening cupidity of those who conducted it, even to the extorting of millions for the ransom of a defenceless city. A few brief facts will suffice to explain the *true*, although, perhaps, not the avowed motives of the war. The British East India contraband trade in opium amounted in value from 15 to 20 millions of dollars yearly, and yielded an annual revenue to the India government of about a million and a half. Hence the East India proprietors have strong pecuniary inducements for poisoning the Chinese. Now the late energetic measures of the Emperor not only contemplated the entire stoppage of this lucrative trade for the future, but occasioned to the East India smugglers an actual present loss of about ten millions of dollars. It is not therefore surprising that the East India interest, both at home and abroad, powerful and extensive as it is, and interwoven with the wealth and aristocracy of the nation, should have persuaded the ministry of the absolute necessity of vindicating British honor, of plac-

ing trade with China on a secure basis for the future, and of bringing the insolent barbarians to their senses.

To some it may seem paradoxical that the same government which has exhibited such a sublime devotion to the rights of the negro, should be so utterly callous to the well-being of the Chinese. The solution is easy. The opium war is a *government measure* adopted by politicians, and probably with the expectation of receiving political support in return from the East India interest; precisely as certain northern members in Congress, in obedience to southern dictation, and in consideration of southern votes, trample upon the right of petition, and do many other things they ought not. The abolition of slavery and the slave trade, on the contrary, so far from originating with the government, were demanded by the PEOPLE of Great Britain in a voice which their rulers were afraid to disregard. Mr. Stanley, one of the ministry, in supporting the Emancipation Bill in the House of Commons, declared that so loudly was it called for by the public, *that no ministry could retain office who refused it.*

To vindicate our strictures from the imputation of national prejudice, we are induced to add a few very brief extracts from British publications, and from the proceedings of public meetings held to remonstrate against this government war. As indicative of the sentiments of the religious community in England, we may refer to the language of two religious periodicals, the first belonging to the dissenting interest, the other to the established church.

The *Eclectic Review*, speaking of the "wholesale confiscation of opium," and of the "breaking up of the haunts of respectable British smugglers," declares, "we have been dealt with according to our deserts. May it provoke us to repentance and a change of conduct."

"If we must have war," says the *Christian Observer*, "it ought to be for a more honorable object than that of indemnifying smugglers whose contraband goods were legally seized and destroyed."

At a public meeting held in London, without reference to party distinctions, the Earl of Stanhope presiding, the following resolution, among others, was passed: "Resolved, that this meeting deeply laments that the moral and religious feeling of the country should be outraged, the character of Christianity disgraced in the eyes of the world, and this kingdom involved in war with upwards of three hundred and fifty millions of peo-

ple, in consequence of British subjects introducing opium into China, in direct and known violation of the laws of that empire."

The celebrated Campbell, in a poetical remonstrance to his nation against the war, after allusions to her former glory, thus gives vent to his indignation at her present baseness:—

"And all thy merchant princes swelled the cry  
That the vile drug must sell, though nations die—  
No more be styled the empress of the main,  
Who strike not now for glory, but for gain;  
Pour o'er the feeble land the poison flood,  
And drive the guilty bargain home with blood."

As a sample of the *spirit* in which this war is carried on by the invaders, we give, in conclusion, an extract from a letter by an eye witness, relating to the capture of the island of Chusan, on the 5th of July, 1840. "Every house was indiscriminately broken open, every drawer and box ransacked, the streets strewed with fragments of furniture, pictures, chairs, tables, grain of all sorts, &c., &c. For two days the bodies were allowed to lay, exposed to sight, where they fell. The plunder, however, was carried to an extreme; that is to say, did not cease till there was nothing else to take, and the plunderers will, no doubt, be able, on our return to Calcutta, to place at their friends' disposal, and for the ornamenting their houses trophies gained, not from the Chinese soldiers, or from a field of battle, but from the harmless and peaceable inhabitants and tradesmen of a city doomed to destruction by our men of war."

The French republic, the terrific progeny of atheism and of crime, not only remained *safe* amid the assaults of her invaders, but turning the tide of war, she poured upon Europe a desolating flood which threatened to engulf every throne and every altar. The power of the republic became concentrated in Napoleon, of whose extraordinary character, *honor* formed no element. Yet Napoleon was not only *safe* but triumphant, till he had nearly acquired the mastership of Europe and his fall was occasioned not by the loss of honor, but by the frosts of Russia.

Perhaps the most sublimated wickedness and baseness in degree, although limited in extent, perpetrated by any civilized government at the present day, is practised in the city of Washington. There, in the boasted citadel of American liberty, native born American citizens are seized and imprisoned

on *suspicion* of being fugitives from bondage; and when the suspicion is disproved by the non-appearance of a claimant, the prisoners are sold as slaves for life, to raise money to pay their *jail fees!!* Does Sir Robert Peel impute the capture of the national metropolis in the last war to this stain on its honor, or to the enterprise and valor of British troops?

It would be *madness*, the Premier tells us, for the two nations to go to war about the boundary. The land in dispute is not worth fighting for; but self-preservation requires each nation to maintain its *honor*. If therefore either party insists on cutting a tree on the wrong side of the alleged line; or should a silly minister think it expedient to display his patriotism by writing a blustering and insulting letter, then indeed two great and Christian nations must, for very safety, commence the work of human butchery.

Would to heaven this rant about national honor was confined to those who are now at the point of the bayonet easing the Chinese of their purses. But we also have politicians who are far more concerned for the *honor* than for the morality of the nation; and these gentlemen have just made the extraordinary discovery, that the honor of the republic requires that her flag shall prove an ægis to villains of all nations, who may think proper to traffic in human flesh.

In 1814, the United States bound themselves by treaty with Great Britain, to use their "best endeavors" to promote the entire abolition of the slave-trade—a stipulation which has been falsified by the conduct of the government from the date of the treaty to the present hour. Great Britain, France, Spain, Portugal, Belgium, Holland, Denmark, Sweden, the empire of Brazil, and the South American republics have mutually agreed that the cruisers of each other may search suspected slavers, bearing any of their flags, and if found engaged in the traffic, to send them to certain ports for trial and condemnation. Russia, dispensing with the formality of a treaty, publishes an ukase virtually giving permission to the cruisers of all nations to do what they please with any slaver who dares to dishonor the Russian flag. But the United States, so far from joining this league of Christendom against an accursed traffic, now aim at rendering it nugatory, by insisting that the star-spangled banner shall protect, even from visitation, every slaver above whose deck it may be unfurled! In vain does Great Britain protest that she claims no right to interfere with *American* slavers; but inasmuch as they are the only

*privileged* ones on the ocean, and as it is a matter of public notoriety that slavers of other nations seek safety in carrying the flag of the republic at their mast head, she does claim the right to ascertain whether a suspected slaver, displaying the American flag, is, or is not, a bona fide *American* vessel, by a sight of her papers. In vain does she admit the right of every American cruiser to ascertain in like manner the national character of any vessel bearing the British flag. In vain does every maritime power in Europe, and all, with one exception in America, accord to all others the same right. The great slaveholding republic is too jealous of her *honor*, to permit an inquiry to be made into the nationality of any vessel from whose mast the stars and stripes are streaming, although that vessel should be a Chinese junk. Let the slave-trade revive in all its unutterable horrors—let thousands and tens of thousands of human beings be consigned to wretchedness and death, but let not a vessel, carrying a piece of bunting with certain devices, be required to show her papers, under the penalty of war. Such is national honor, the safeguard of nations, and, for the maintenance of which, national slaughter is indispensable!

---

#### MORE FACTS CONCERNING OUR REVOLUTIONARY WAR.

BY REV. SYLVESTER JUDD.

Our limits did not permit us to publish last month all we wished from Mr. Judd's Discourse; and we now give the remaining extracts, with the request, that our readers will look again at the remarks with which we introduced the subject in our last number. Our sole object has been to let a standard author speak for himself, and to illustrate, from the least exceptionable war on the pages of profane history, the guilt and evils of the war-system, perhaps the greatest sin and folly, curse and shame of Christendom.

#### A NEW VIEW OF REVOLUTIONARY PATRIOTS.

We have been accustomed to think that our fathers, during the long and arduous struggle for liberty, of the Revolution, were exceedingly patriotic, zealous, patient, disinterested, self-sacrificing, high-minded. There was genuine patriotism in the sense of love for the country. But whether there was patriotism in the sense of a sincere wish and energetic purpose to support an eight years' war, is another question. The writer